

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated October 10, 2006, the Examiner cites U.S. Patent No. 6,697,815 ("Wilson") as disclosing the claimed "model bean." (Office Action, p. 3) However, as described below, the Examiner's citations refer to multiple software elements, none of which are model beans.

The model bean is a "java class that is able to hold data elements inside, to 'set' these data elements to specific values, and then subsequently 'get' these values back out." Specification, pp. 13-14. The model bean holds the data that "results from processing a web page request that is to be used to present the requested web page." *Id.* As required by the claims, as amended, the model bean is "is constructed by" or "executed on" the web server, and does not contain any "processing steps" See also Specification, p. 14 (the model bean does not contain any "business logic or formatting logic.").

The Examiner cites two different beans described in Wilson as meeting the "model bean" limitation: Fig. 2, element 206 and Col. 6, lines 48-49. However, both of these beans contain business or formatting (processing) logic and can therefore not be model beans because they perform "processing steps" that are excluded by the claims as Amended. See Wilson, Col. 7, lines 12-14, 24-36, Col. 8, lines 53-60.

Additionally, Cols. 7-8, lines 62-35 and Col. 4, lines 13-15, also cited by the Examiner, disclose a User Interface ("UI") record or object that is populated by a back-end computer. There is no disclosure or suggestion that this record can also be a bean. In fact, Wilson teaches away from this, stating that the record originates on the back-end

computer, and not the web server. Col. 4 lines 8-11. Accordingly, this bean is not constructed by the web server as required by the amended claims. Wilson also discloses that the UI record may be in the same computer language as the back-end software (and is therefore not a Java Bean). Col. 8, lines 7-9. This can be a significant difference. For example, consider a system where multiple back-end systems need to be accessed by a web server. Under the Wilson prior art the web server would receive a record from each back-end system, written in the native language of that system. Any changes to the web server would need to be replicated in multiple software languages, on multiple back-end systems. Centralizing the software on the web server and using a common language, a java bean, simplifies designing and modifying the software.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art of record does not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed system, and the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejections of all claims be withdrawn.

The Applicant apologizes for any inaccuracy or inconsistency with its description of the July 6, 2006 telephonic interview. It was not the Applicant's intent to misrepresent the substance of the interview. The Applicant apologizes for any unintentional

Serial No. 09/919,727

Attorney Docket: 74577/044

inaccuracy and will not rely on its prior-stated understanding of the substance of the interview.

Respectfully submitted,

PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
Attorney for Applicant(s)

By: 

Nolan M. Goldberg
Reg. No. 54,126

Date: April 3, 2007

PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
1585 Broadway
New York, NY 10036-8299
Telephone: (212) 969-3000